Environmental Protection Agency
FY 2000 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification
Table of Contents

Special Analysis

MAJOR MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Introduction

EPA's Strategic Plan identifies long-term goals designed to achieve the Agency's mission to protect human health and to safeguard the natural environment – air, water, and land – upon which life depends. Within these goals, EPA has developed shorter term objectives that provide specific measurable outcomes that are achievable over the next few years. The Agency's planning, budgeting, analysis, and accountability process was designed to improve EPA's ability to achieve results and to meet the requirements of GPRA. At the same time, we are aware of the complex management challenges that must be addressed in order to achieve desired program results in a manner consistent with established policies and procedures designed to maintain the integrity of our programs.

EPA's Senior Leadership Council, comprised of executives throughout the Agency, continues to meet with key representatives from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the General Accounting Office (GAO), and EPA's Inspector General (OIG) to hear their perspectives on important Agency and program management issues. These discussions help to identify opportunities for management improvement initiatives within the Agency. We are currently focusing on a number of these management issues that if, not addressed, could adversely impact achievement of the Agency's mission. The ten issue areas are summarized below.

Year 2000 Compliance

The Agency has evaluated all mission-critical systems to determine whether they are Year 2000 compliant. We are on track to correct identified problems and expect all mission-critical systems will be compliant by March 30, 1999. The Agency is currently assessing other infrastructure assets including non-mission-critical systems, central and local infrastructure, and buildings and facilities and will correct any identified deficiencies. In addition, we are working with external stakeholders to address problems with the exchange of data related to Y2K. The Agency formed a Year 2000 Council of senior Agency officials to review program progress, receive early warnings of potential problems, and take necessary actions to avoid critical delays. The Agency has greatly expanded its outreach efforts to ensure the continuity of environmental services to the public. During the past year, the President's Council on Year 2000 Conversion has broadened its focus to include an emphasis on preparedness in twenty-nine specific sectors of the Nation's economy. EPA is responsible for coordination and outreach in three of those sections: Water, Waste, and Chemicals.

Environmental Information

Environmental information is essential to effective decision-making for EPA. The challenges of acquiring, maintaining, and sharing accurate and high quality environmental information is a strategic EPA priority. Without timely, accurate, and appropriate data for decision-making, EPA managers cannot accurately assess how well Agency programs are meeting their program mandates.

This information challenge facing us is so critical that if Agency investments to reinvent environmental information are not effective, the Agency's basic capability to implement performance management as required of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) will be seriously hindered.

The EPA Inspector General and GAO have already expressed concerns about the accuracy, timeliness, and consistency of data the Agency collects, manages, and shares. In response to these criticisms, EPA's Chief Information Officer has established three environmental information investment priorities for FY 2000: **Public Access**; **Data Quality**; and **Agency Information**. These priorities reflect the Administrator's commitment to strong leadership on information management – a commitment that encompasses not only reinventing EPA's environmental information, but which also extends to creating a reinvented EPA Information Management Program. Within this broad commitment, the Agency has made many specific information management commitments. Lead offices from across the Agency will report on progress of ongoing and planned activities and commitments in their Mid-Year Assurance Letters and at the Senior Leadership Council Meetings held to discuss management integrity issues throughout 1999.

Public Access

Internet: The Agency has enjoyed considerable success in making environmental and regulatory information available by means of the Internet. The EPA Website handles more than a million "hits" per day and enables citizens to information concerning basic environmental concepts, EPA regulatory activity, environmental research and detailed information about the environmental conditions in their communities. For example, the public is able to simply enter their zip code and receive detailed reports on releases of toxic chemicals, permitted facilities, air and water quality, etc. In FY 2000, the Agency Internet offerings will be enhanced by cataloging Internet materials and delivering information based on individual subjects (indoor air, watershed protection) and their intended audience (students, regulated businesses, or environmental professionals). This new approach to EPA information will include Agency publications, policy, guidance, and regulations, providing a more comprehensive picture of EPA's involvement on a topic.

Center for Information and Environmental Statistics (CEIS): CEIS was created in 1997 as part of EPA's national effort to improve public access to the Agency's information resources. For more than 30 years, EPA and state public health and environmental agencies have been collecting data on sources of pollution, toxic releases to the environment, and ambient environmental conditions. CEIS is improving public access to EPA's information resources so that individuals, communities, businesses, and other organizations can obtain these data, learn about their quality, potential applications and limitations, and then apply them in ways that enables them to protect public health and safeguard the natural environment. By surveying EPA's information users and the public's needs, CEIS focuses on reporting these data and information in ways that can support these individual, community, state, and regional efforts to protect public health and the environment. In FY 2000, the CEIS will begin a process to evaluate the effectiveness of their efforts and improve the usefulness of the data they make available. CEIS plans to create an interface that will be responsive to the needs

of users while working with the specific data collections to define the environmental risks and public health implications the data may communicate.

Reinventing Environmental Regulations: In FY 2000, the Executive Steering Committee for Information Resources Management will provide funding for public access activities including: One-Stop Reporting - working with the states to improve reporting efficiency and data quality and to provide the public with better data; Enhanced Public Access - providing access to the Agency's interpretive guidance through the Internet; and Public Access Tools and Methods - providing better access to EPA information through improvements to Internet data. Each of these investments represents improvements to core components of the Agency's information infrastructure or business processes for collecting, managing, and disseminating environmental data. These improvement are essential to ensure continued high performance of the Agency's Website.

Data Quality

Reinventing Environmental Information (REI) Initiative: REI is the EPA's commitment, in partnership with the states, to implement key information management reforms that are essential to support the Agency's new and evolving approaches to environmental protection. Within the next five years, REI will focus on incorporating data standards and electronic reporting into EPA's national systems, with priority on the Agency's compliance systems. Additionally, the Agency will enhance its information management processes to ensure these efforts are successful. REI will be institutionalized within the new Office of Information. Standards development will be completed in early FY 2000, when the focus of the program will shift to implementation by program systems.

Data Quality Strategic Plan: The Agency is developing a Data Quality Strategic Plan that recommends several items to improve data quality, including: the development of data quality performance standards for each of EPA's major data systems to track and improve data quality over time; an error correction process to ensure that discrepancies in EPA data are routed to the appropriate data managers; and the establishment of customer service performance standards for each major data system to ensure that discrepancies are addressed promptly and appropriately.

Agency Information

New Office: In October 1998, the EPA Administrator announced her intention to establish a single program manager for information management, policy, and information technology stewardship. This office will be responsible for developing and implementing goals, standards and accountability systems to manage and improve the quality of information used both within the Agency and provided to the public. In accomplishing this goal, the office would: assure that the quality of data collected and used by EPA is known and is appropriate for its intended uses; reduce information collection and reporting burden; fill significant data gaps; and provide integrated environmental and public health information and statistics to the public. A senior management team was established to begin working with cross-Agency projects to ensure their success during the transition. In FY 2000

the office will complete its' organization and begin coordinating information policy and procedures across the Agency.

Systems Modernization: In FY 2000, EPA will establish a fund to better meet and manage the urgent need to modernize systems that support the REI commitment and other mission requirements on a multi-year basis. EPA senior management recognized the criticality of: central funding and decision-making for modernizing systems; managing system modernization as a capital investment exercise; prioritization to address funding shortages and uncertainties; and allowing investment decisions to be optimized at Agency level. The system modernization fund is linked to successful REI implementation by providing a stable funding base which will: facilitate better systems development planning; reduce uncertainties that cause delays and cost overruns; and ensure that systems adhere to Agency IRM architecture and data standards. The Agency's senior management has determined that the core components of a successful systems modernization business process are: central funding and decision-making for modernizing systems; managing system modernization as a capital investment; setting clear priorities to address significant performance gaps, effectively allocating limited modernization resources, and responding to the Administration's new information initiatives; and finally, where appropriate, ensuring investment decisions leverage achievement of Agency goals - not simply individual program goals. The system modernization fund is linked to successful REI implementation by providing a stable funding base which will facilitate better systems development planning; reduce uncertainties that cause delays and cost overruns; and ensure that systems adhere to the Agency's IRM architecture and data standards.

Information Systems Security

Audits by the OIG found that security plans for many of the Agency's major applications and general support systems were deficient or non-existent. At risk is the potential unauthorized access, use, modification, or destruction of environmental information in EPA's databases. In fact, a recent OIG audit found unauthorized contractor access to confidential business information. Accordingly, EPA declared Information Systems Security as a material weakness in its 1997 Integrity Act Report to the President and Congress.

The Agency implemented a corrective action strategy to address this issue that involved: 1) developing a model information security program that provides a framework for the managerial role in organizational security planning and oversight; 2) providing detailed guidance with explicit examples and narratives for security plan development; and 3) developing security plans for the Agency's telecommunications network and National Computer Center computer platforms. In addition, EPA's Chief Information Officer (CIO) will issue an annual requirement for certification of information security plans, activities, and accomplishments. The CIO will perform periodic reviews of security plans to ensure the Agency's information resources and environmental data are secure and existing risks and vulnerabilities are addressed. EPA's OIG will review the adequacy of the security controls contained in the plans. We anticipate final corrective actions to be completed by the end of FY 1999.

EPA Oversight of Enforcement Activities

OIG findings in several audits disclosed fundamental weaknesses with state identification and reporting of significant violations of the Clean Air Act (CAA). Without information about significant violators, EPA can neither assess the adequacy of the states' enforcement programs, nor take action when a state does not enforce the Act. Moreover, because violators were not always reported, EPA's information systems were unable to communicate accurate information to the general public. The Agency is evaluating current policies, revising them where necessary, and providing training to implement the revised policies. In addition, the Agency has begun the quality assurance of enforcement data through increased analysis of regional and state performance measures, and will review all CAA title V applications for compliance certifications to assess current compliance status. Other actions are underway to ensure correction of this issue.

Air enforcement is also designated as a major management commitment to ensure it gets proper attention by the Agency's senior managers. The Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance will report on progress of ongoing and planned activities in their Mid-Year Assurance Letters and at the Senior Leadership Council Meetings held to discuss management integrity issues in 1999.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits (NPDES)

A key element of the Agency's effort to achieve its overarching goal of clean and safe water is the reduction of pollutant discharges from point sources and nonpoint sources. Under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program (which includes NPDES permits, urban wet weather, animal feeding operation mining, pretreatment program for non-domestic wastewater discharges into municipal sanitary sewers, and biosolids management controls), establishes controls on pollutants discharged from point sources into waters of the United States. Key annual performance goals in 2000 are to reduce industrial discharges of toxic pollutants by 4 million pounds per year, non-conventional pollutants by 1,500 million pounds per year, and conventional pollutants by 388 million pounds per year as compared to 1992 dischargers when considerations for growth are considered. Meeting this goal is contingent upon the timely issuance of quality permits.

In 1998, the Office of Inspector General identified the NPDES permit backlog as a candidate for material weakness under FMFIA. The Agency's FY 1998 Integrity Act Report accepted the IG's determination. The backlog in EPA issued permits has tripled over the last 10 years, and the backlog in State issued permits has doubled over the same time period. Facilities operating under expired permits are not required to meet new or updated effluent guidelines, water quality standards, or total maximum daily loads within a watershed framework until the permit is renewed.

To address the environmental consequences of this, the Agency has developed and is implementing a multi-year backlog reduction plan. The plan will focus permit efforts on those facilities considered to be environmentally significant such as facilities discharging into high priority watersheds, discharging at high volumes, discharging pollutants such as toxics, or having other

significant water quality impacts. The Agency is also investigating the use of tools such as general permits for lower risk facilities.

Contract Management

Audits conducted by the Agency's Office of the Inspector General this year indicated that EPA had taken many positive steps to correct contract management deficiencies and as a result has eliminated contracts management as an Agency-level weakness. However, since personal service relationships with contractors still remain a concern, the Agency declared relationships with contractors an Agency-level weakness in the FY 1998 Integrity Process. The Office of Administration and Resource Management prepared a corrective action plan that includes additional training for project officers, and a requirement for Assistant and Regional Administrators to perform a management review for personal services, particularly on high risk contracts with on-site contractors. A report on results will be included in their Mid Year Assurance Letters.

The Agency, under its "Contracts 2000" initiative is continuing to scrutinize contract actions to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of EPA's contracts, looking at lessons learned from the contracting strategies over the past several years. In addition, the Agency is emphasizing the importance of choosing the appropriate contract type, considering where performance based contracts would be more cost effective and efficient. Currently, the Agency is placing particular emphasis on improving Superfund contracts, providing oversight of the Independent Government Cost Estimates to ensure cost effective use of contract dollars. Another contract initiative provides for phasing in new contracting vehicles, while improving the contracting capacity that is currently in place for the Superfund remedial action contracts.

Construction Grants Close-Out

EPA designated construction grants close-out as a material weakness in FY 1996 to provide government-wide attention to the fact that billions of dollars in construction grants awarded in the last 20 years were not closed out. The result leaves millions of dollars in potentially ineligible program costs from being recovered for reuse on other high-priority state clean water projects.

The Agency developed and implemented a strategy to expedite project audits that are on the critical path to project closeout. The process has allowed program officials to close out more projects than before without requesting an audit, and has expedited scheduling and completion of the necessary audits. The Agency continues to work with the Regions and states to develop revised projections consistent with the audit strategy. The Agency is sustaining the effort to: 1) maintain the priority of, and attention to, administrative completions, audits and dispute resolutions, and close-outs; 2) assure that close-out resources are directed to organizational units where inadequacy of resources impedes more rapid completion and close out of projects; and 3) update plans developed in each of the Regions with specific actions to successfully close out the program.

Currently, the Agency has reduced the amount of grants waiting to be closed from the 1990 level of 5,860 projects with a grant amount of $34 billion to the level at the end of FY 1998 of 399 projects totaling $7 billion. We expect to achieve success in closing our the remainder of projects by the end of FY 2002.

Non-Construction Grants Close-Out and Oversight of Assistance Agreements

As a result of 1996 Congressional hearings and Office of Inspector General audits, the Agency identified a material weakness in the areas of grant closeouts and oversight of assistance agreements. To address this issue, EPA has developed a national closeout strategy to eliminate the non-construction grants backlog and prevent it from reoccurring. The strategy includes a policy that will engage EPA Grants Management Offices in a pro-active practice of post-award monitoring and management of assistance agreements. The policy identifies ten baseline monitoring activities applicable to all grants and a small percentage that will require on-site reviews and technical assistance. All Grants Management Offices will fully implement the policy by 2000. In addition, the Agency is developing a policy for post award management of grants and cooperative agreements by Headquarters Program Offices and Regional Program Divisions. This policy will ensure that each program develops and implements an annual monitoring plan.

The Agency has made significant progress in closing out the backlog of open grants. As of December 31, 1998, the Agency has closed 90% of the non-construction grant backlog and plans to eliminate the entire backlog by July 2000.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System

In 1995, GAO conducted an audit of national RCRA information systems, specifically the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS). GAO identified three major problems that needed to be addressed:

1) data entry and access is cumbersome;
2) system complexity hinders the ability of States to use the system; and
3) data quality is not reliable because of lack of clear definitions and a lack of a national quality assurance plan.

In response to the GAO audit, the Agency reported RCRIS as an Agency-level FMFIA weakness in 1997 with a target correction date of 2002. GAO agreed that EPA, under the WIN/INFORMED initiative (a joint initiative between the Agency and the states), is taking the appropriate corrective action to address the identified problems. EPA took steps to streamline RCRIS which GAO indicated met their requirement for short-term streamlining. In addition, the Agency took steps to reduce the extent of data states are required to provide. The Agency continues to work on changes to facilitate the creation of and access to RCRIS data such as migrating data entry to an Internet-based platform to eliminate cumbersome mainframe based data entry software.

Agency-Wide Peer Review

In FY 1997, GAO reported that implementation of the EPA's Peer Review Policy was uneven across the Agency. A more extensive internal evaluation substantiated GAO's claims. The Agency reported peer review as an Agency-level management control weakness and developed a corrective action plan. This plan included revising the Peer Review Standards Operating Procedures, reiterating the Agency policy, and developing and presenting training on the revised procedures. Ongoing evaluation of the implementation of peer review will provide feedback on the effectiveness of the corrective actions. The Agency expects completion of its next evaluation by the end of FY 1999. In addition, GAO is conducting a new review on Federal Agencies' Peer Review of Scientific Research, and OIG is conducting a survey of the Agency's selection of peer reviewers.

EPA USER FEE PROGRAM

In 2000, EPA has four (4) user fee programs in operation and is proposing four (4) additional user fee programs. These user fee programs follows:

USER FEES CURRENTLY BEING COLLECTED

- **Motor Vehicle and Engine Compliance Program Fee**

  This fee is authorized by the Clean Air Act of 1990 and is managed by the Office of Air and Radiation. Fee collections began in August 1992. This fee is imposed on manufacturers of light-duty vehicles, light and heavy trucks, and motorcycles. It covers the cost of certifying new engines and vehicles and monitoring compliance of in-use engines and vehicles. In 2000, EPA expects to collect over $10.8 million from this fee.

- **Pesticide Reregistration Maintenance Fee**

  The 1988 amendments to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) mandated accelerated reregistration of all pesticide products registered prior to November 1984. Congress authorized the Agency to collect two kinds of fees - Pesticide Reregistration Fees and annual Pesticide Maintenance Fees. The Pesticide Reregistration Fee expired in 1992. The Agency continues to collect Pesticide Maintenance Fees, which are deposited into the non-appropriated Reregistration and Expedited Processing Revolving Fund (FIFRA Fund). Pesticide Maintenance Fees are assessed on the manufacturers of active ingredients used in pesticide products based on the manufacturer's market share. The Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (FQPA) extended Pesticide Maintenance Fees through 2001 and increased the cap on fees by $2.0 million. EPA expects to collect $16.0 million from this fee in 2000.

- **Pesticide Tolerance Fee**

  A tolerance is the maximum legal limit of a pesticide residue in and on food commodities and animal feed. In 1954, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) authorized the collection of fees for the establishment of tolerances on raw agricultural commodities and in food commodities. These fees supplement annual appropriated funds for EPA's Tolerance Program and are also deposited into the FIFRA Fund. Annually the fees are adjusted by the percentage change in the Federal employee General Schedule (GS) pay scale. In 2000, the Agency expects to replace this fee with a more comprehensive cost-recovery fee. The FFDCA, as amended by FQPA, mandates that EPA must require the payment of such fees as will, in the aggregate, be sufficient to provide, equip, and maintain an adequate service for establishing tolerances. The Agency is reevaluating the fee schedule to recover the full cost of tolerance determinations as directed by the FQPA. In 2000, EPA will work to finalize the

needed rules to increase tolerance fees to ensure that the tolerance setting process will be as self-supporting as possible by 2001.

- **Pre-manufacture Notice Fee**

  Since 1989, this fee has been collected for the review and processing of new chemical Pre-Manufacture Notices (PMN) submitted to EPA by the chemical industry. They are paid at the time of submission of the PMN for review by EPA's Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances. PMN fees are authorized by the Toxic Substances Control Act and contain a cap on the amount the Agency may charge for a PMN review. EPA expects to collect $3.0 million in PMN fees in 2000 under the existing fee structure.

USER FEE PROPOSALS

- **Pesticide Registration Fee**

  The Administration will propose authorization language, subject to an appropriations language trigger, to implement the Pesticide Registration Fee authorized by the FIFRA and U.S.C. 9701 "Fees and Charges For Government Services and Things of Value." Following enactment of authorization and appropriations language, the Agency expects to collect $16 million in 2000 from the reinstatement of Pesticide Registration Fees that Congress suspend through 2001. Through such fees, manufacturers of new pesticide products share the cost of ensuring that authorized uses of these products do not pose unreasonable risk to human health and the environment. Pesticide Registration Fees will be deposited into a special fund in the U.S. Treasury to be available to the Agency, subject to appropriation, to cover the cost of issuing registrations.

- **National Pollution Discharge and Elimination System (NPDES) Fee**

  EPA will finalize a regulation to collect non-refundable fees for developing, issuing, and modifying NPDES permits. These fees will be collected for selected EPA-issued NPDES permits and will be charged when a draft permit is issued for new facilities and modified permits are issued for existing facilities.

- **Pre-manufacture Notice Fee**

  The Agency is proposing appropriations language to raise the existing Pre-Manufacture Notice (PMN) fees to allow the Agency to cover the full cost of the PMN program. This language would modify the current statutory cap in the Toxic Substances Control Act on the total fee that EPA is allowed to charge. Under the current fee structure, the Agency will collect $3,000,000 in FY 2000. The Agency expects to collect $8,000,000 annually from the fee cap modification, when fully implemented. The increase in PMN fees will be deposited

into a special fund in the U.S. Treasury, available to the Agency, subject to appropriation. In FY 2000 after the anticipated rulemaking, the Agency estimates collections of $4,000,000.

- **Lead Accreditation and Certification Fee**

  The Toxic Substances Control Act, Title IV, Section 402(a)(3), mandates the development of a schedule of fees for persons operating lead training programs accredited under the 402/404 rule and for lead-based paint utilities contractors certified under this rule. The training programs ensure that lead paint abatement is done safely. Fees collected for this activity will be deposited in the U.S. Treasury. The Agency expects to finalize this rule in 1999, and estimates that less than $500,000 will be deposited in 2000 and subsequent years.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

In 2000, the Agency begins its fourth year of operation of the Working Capital Fund (WCF). A WCF is a revolving fund authorized by law to finance a cycle of operations, where the costs of goods and services provided are charged to the users on a fee-for-service basis. The funds received are available without fiscal year limitation, to continue operations and to replace capital equipment. EPA's WCF was implemented under the authority of Section 403 of the Government Management Reform Act of 1994 and EPA's FY 1997 Appropriations Act. Permanent WCF authority was contained in the FY 1998 Appropriations Act.

The Chief Financial Officer and the Office of the Comptroller initiated the WCF in FY 1997 as part of their effort to: (1) be accountable to Agency offices, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Congress; (2) increase the efficiency of the administrative services provided to program offices; and (3) increase customer service and responsiveness. The Agency has a WCF Board which provides policy and planning oversight and advises the CFO regarding the WCF financial position. The Board, chaired by the Deputy CFO, is composed of seventeen permanent members from the program offices and the regional offices.

Two Agency services, begun in FY 1997 will continue into FY 1999. These are the Agency's computer center and telecommunications operations, managed by the Enterprise Technology Services Division (ETSD), Research Triangle Park, North Carolina and Agency postage costs, managed by the Office of Administration, Washington, DC. The Agency's 2000 budget request includes resources for these two activities in each National Program Manager's submission, totaling approximately $110 million. These estimated resources may be increased to incorporate program office's additional service needs during the operating year. To the extent that these increases are subject to Congressional reprogramming notifications, the Agency will comply.

THE CUSTOMER SERVICE PROGRAM

The Customer Service Program (CSP) was established in 1993, immediately after President Clinton signed Executive Order 12862, "Setting Customer Service Standards." The Office of Policy provides staff support, coordinates an annual conference, and chairs EPA's Customer Service Steering Committee (CSSC), the group that sets CSP policy. By involving approximately 400 individuals from staff and management through CSSC work groups and office/region/laboratory Consumer Service councils, the Agency leverages its two person customer service staff to implement the Agency's Customer Service Strategy.

What Improved Customer Service Will Achieve

EPA published a Customer Service Plan in September 1995, and in May 1997, officially adopted critical process standards and a set of universal principles that apply to the work of everyone at EPA. These six standards focus on:

- helping all EPA employees understand the importance and substantial mission related benefits of improving service to the public;
- providing employees with goals and guidelines for improvement and involving them in identifying and attempting to eliminate barriers to achieving standards;
- providing training to build staff capacity to achieve the standards and effectively apply customer service skills;
- developing measurement and tracking systems to document service and product improvements;
- learning what we need to do to increase satisfaction with our services and our treatment of customers; and recognizing and rewarding customer service excellence.

By 2003, all EPA staff will be meeting the customer service standards that apply to their work and will have received training necessary to assist them to achieve the standards.

Because customer feedback and satisfaction measurement are critical underpinnings to the overall program, in 1998 the CSP developed "Hearing the Voice of the Customer - Customer Feedback and Customer Satisfaction Measurement Guidelines." In 1999, CSP will sponsor workshops to train an advisor/consultant group to assist people across the Agency to use the guidelines to obtain and use customer input. All feedback instruments will be cleared through the OMB under the CSP generic Information Collection Request (ICR) for customer satisfaction surveys. The CSP reports bi-monthly to the National Partnership for Reinventing Government and the American people via the Internet. This initiative, "Conversations with America," solicits and gathers customers' comments and ideas for improving EPA's products and services.

Nearly 200 EPA staff are certified to facilitate training across the Agency. Many are involved in delivering both Forging the Links, an EPA specific service workshop, and customer skills courses that supplement the workshop. Through sharing benchmarking/best practices information and by sponsoring the annual conference, the CSP supplements training opportunities. Through recognizing outstanding service, the Agency highlights, encourages, and reinforces service excellence.

Expected Results

In support of the Customer Service Executive Order and various Presidential memorandums in FY 2000, the Agency will maintain leadership and coordination of the National CSP by providing:

- policy and guidance development;
- communication and liaison with Senior managers, the National Partnership for Reinventing Government (NPR), and other federal and state partners;
- best practices research;
- conversations with American reporting;
- direct and contractual support to the CSP committees and work groups;
- continuous support for guidelines and measurements;
- a third National Customer Service Conference;
- increased access to CSP information via the Intra and Internet.

EPA's Administrator Carol Browner has stated that "EPA will be a model for all regulatory agencies by fully integrating customer satisfaction measures into our strategic planning, budgeting and decision making, while recognizing the diversity of our customers and the need for balancing competing and conflicting interests. Above all, we will strengthen our ability to listen to the voice of our customers so that we can identify their needs and act upon them." The Customer Service Program supports the Administration's commitment to enhance customer service.

COSTS AND BENEFITS OF ECONOMICALLY SIGNIFICANT RULES IN FY 1999 OR FY 2000

Goal 1: Clean Air

Automobile and Light-Duty Truck Manufacturing (Surface Coating) NESHAP/VOC Reductions

This action will result in the reduction of HAPs and VOCs emitted by the automobile and light-duty truck manufacturing industry. The major HAPs emitted from surface coating operations include ethylene glycol monobutyl ether, methyl ethyl ketone, methyl isobutyl ketone, toluene, and xylene, among others. There are approximately 60 automobile and light-duty truck assembly plants in the U.S. This project is in the data gathering phase; thus, quantitative estimates of costs and benefits are not available at this time.

Industrial Combustion Coordinated Rulemaking - ICCR Project

The EPA is developing combustion-related regulations for five source categories. The source categories are: combustion turbines, internal combustion engines, industrial/commercial/institutional boilers, process heaters, and solid waste incinerators burning non-hazardous waste. These regulations are being developed under Sections 111, 112, and 129 of the CAA. Sections 111 and 129 require maximum achievable control technology (MACT) floors and MACT levels to be determined. MACT standards apply to both new and existing facilities. Section 111 requires the development of new source performance standards (NSPS). These regulations apply to new, modified, and reconstructed sources and do not apply to existing sources. These source categories are widespread and one or more of these source categories are located at virtually every manufacturing and chemical plant in the US. Section 112 standards apply to a list of 189 hazardous air pollutants (HAPs); Section 129 standards apply to 9 pollutants (dioxin and furans, mercury, cadmium, lead, particulate matter and opacity, sulfur dioxide, hydrogen chloride, oxides of nitrogen, and carbon monoxide) which are a combination of HAP's and criteria pollutants; and Section 111 applies to criteria pollutants. There is likely to be some regulatory interaction between these source categories since many are collocated at the same plant site. Therefore, EPA is undertaking a coordinated rulemaking with early and continuing stakeholder participation, including participation by small entity representatives. A coordinated participatory rulemaking offers benefits to all stakeholders including: the opportunity for stakeholders to shape regulatory development, more cost-effective regulations, avoidance of duplicative or conflicting regulations, simpler regulations, compliance flexibility, EPA and stakeholder resource savings in rule development, and an improved scientific basis for regulations. The benefits and costs resulting from the ICCR are not known at this time. Control Technologies and their efficiencies and costs are still being investigated. More should be known in early to mid 1999. It is expected that the costs and benefits could be large due to the fact that there are potentially hundreds of thousands of affected facilities located at almost all types of industrial facilities.

NESHAP: Integrated Iron and Steel

The Clean Air Act, as amended November 1990, requires the EPA to regulate categories of major and area sources of hazardous air pollutants (HAP). The EPA has determined that integrated iron and steel mills emit several of the 189 HAP listed (including compounds of chromium, lead, manganese, toluene, and polycyclic organic matter) in quantities sufficient to designate them as major sources. As a consequence, integrated iron and steel facilities are among the HAP-emitting source categories selected for regulation. The integrated iron & steel NESHAP will significantly reduce hazardous air pollutant metals and particulate emissions from these sources. The cost and benefits analysis for this NESHAP has not been completed, as a result this rule may not constitute an economically significant (major) rule under E.O. 12866.. This analysis should be completed in October 1999.

Control of Air Pollution from Marine Diesel Engines Rulemaking

This rulemaking will serve to reduce harmful emissions from marine diesel engines rated over 37 kW. The measurable benefit of the regulation will be an approximately 35 percent reduction in emissions of oxides of nitrogen and particulate matter from these engines. The costs of the rulemaking will be borne by the manufacturers of marine diesel engines and will likely be passed on in part to their customers in the form of higher prices. No direct costs will be borne by any government or household. Total estimated costs to society range from $40 million to $110 million per year (in 1998 dollars). A net present value over 20 years is calculated to be approximately $700 million when discounted at 7 percent. Monetized benefits estimates for this rulemaking are not yet available.

Heavy-duty Gasoline Engines/Vehicles Rulemaking

EPA proposed NOX plus NMHC standards for 2004 and later model year heavy-duty diesel and Otto-cycle (e.g. spark ignition / gasoline-fueled) engines. EPA finalized the standards for diesel engines (62 FR 54694, October 21, 1997) but did not finalize the standards for Otto-cycle engines. In a Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, EPA will be proposing new HD Otto-cycle engine and vehicle standards. Currently, EPA has a vehicle program for vehicles up to 8,500 pounds gross vehicle weight (GVWR) and an engine-based program for engines used in vehicles with GVWRs above 8,500 pounds. EPA plans to propose to move complete HD vehicles (about 70 percent of HD gasoline engines) into the vehicle program. Examples of vehicles included in this category are large full size pickup, the largest sport utility vehicles, and full size cargo and commercial passenger vans. EPA will also be proposing engine-based standards for engines used in vehicles not covered by the vehicle program. The new standards would reduce emissions of oxides of nitrogen and hydrocarbons from these engines by about 75 percent from current levels beginning with the 2004 model year. Cost and benefits estimates are not yet available for this rule, however, EPA anticipates that it will be an economically significant (major) rule under E.O. 12866.

Tier II Light-duty Vehicle and Light-duty Truck Rulemaking

The Tier II rulemaking will be a significant rulemaking under the definitions in Executive Order 12866. This rulemaking will propose the next generation of emission standards for light-duty vehicles and light-duty trucks. The primary focus of this action will be reducing emissions of nitrogen oxides and non-methane hydrocarbons, pollutants which contribute to ozone pollution. Highway vehicles are significant contributors to ozone pollution, though tighter standards will also have additional air quality benefits. These standards cannot go into effect before the 2004 model year, as per Clean Air Act requirements. EPA is also planning on addressing more stringent standards for heavy-duty gasoline engines, effective no earlier than model year 2007, in this rulemaking since many of the technologies used to achieve better emissions performance of light-duty trucks could also be used to reduce emissions from heavy-duty gasoline engines. The rulemaking will also propose limitations on the sulfur content of gasoline. Sulfur has a detrimental impact on catalyst performance and could be a limiting factor in the introduction of advanced technologies on motor vehicles. There are also additional air quality benefits, such as particulate matter and sulfate reductions, associated with reducing sulfur levels in gasoline. This rulemaking is in a very early stage of development, and related cost and benefit estimates are not yet available. Therefore, it may not constitute an economically significant (major) rule under E.O. 12866.

Goal 2: Clean and Safe Water

NPDES Storm Water Phase II Rule

The proposed NPDES storm water phase II rule establishes a permitting program to regulate contaminated storm water discharges from small municipal separate storm sewer systems in urbanized areas and small construction sites (between one and five acres). There are some waivers built into the draft rule, reducing or eliminating application requirements where there is little or no environmental impact. For the rulemaking components that have been proposed, the Agency estimated total annual costs ranging from $141 million to $880 million (1997 dollars) . Benefits associated with the proposed rule include improvements to water quality and reduced human health risks. Estimated annual monetized benefits associated with financial, recreational, and health related improvements ranged from $175 million to $573 million (1997 dollars) annually. The Agency has identified additional benefit categories that it was unable to monetize and thus are not included in these estimates. The Agency received a wide range of comments through various public forums and expects that revisions will be made to these estimates. EPA plans to finalize this rule in October 1999.

Proposed Regulation Governing Cooling Water Intake Structures

EPA is developing regulations for proposal under Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), 33 U.S.C. Section 1326(b). The proposed regulation governing cooling water intake structures is unique in that it applies to the intake of water and not the discharge. Section 316(b) provides that any standard established pursuant to Sections 301 or 306 of the Clean Water Act and applicable to a point source shall require that the location, design, construction, and capacity of cooling water intake structures reflect the best technology available (BTA) for minimizing adverse

environmental impact. A primary purpose of Section 316(b) is to minimize the impingement and entrainment of fish and other aquatic organisms by a facility's cooling water intake. Impingement refers to the trapping of fish and other aquatic life in cooling water intake screens. Entrainment occurs when aquatic organisms, eggs and larvae are sucked into the cooling system, through the heat exchanger, and then pumped back out. EPA is currently estimating costs and benefits of this rule and will make them available when the rule is proposed.

National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Disinfectants/Disinfection Byproducts Rule

The regulation for Stage 1 Disinfectant/Disinfection Byproducts (DBPs) is intended to expand existing public health protections and address concerns about risk trade-offs between pathogens and disinfection byproducts. EPA has estimated that the total annualized cost, for implementing the Stage 1 DBP rule is $702 million in 1998 dollars. This estimate includes annualized treatment costs to utilities ($593 million), start-up and annualized monitoring costs to utilities ($91.7 million), and startup and annualized monitoring costs to states ($17.3 million). Annualized treatment costs to utilities includes annual operation and maintenance costs ($362 million) and annualized capital costs assuming a 7 percent cost of capital as the discount rate ($231 million). While the benefits of this rule are difficult to quantify because of the uncertainty associated with risks from exposure to DBPs (and the resultant reductions in risk due the decreased exposure from DBPs), EPA believes that there is reasonable likelihood that benefits will exceed the costs. The potential economic benefits of the Stage 1 DBP rule derive from the increased level of public health protection and associated decreased level of risk. The quantification of the benefits resulting from DBP control is masked by the uncertainty in the understanding of the health risks. Epidemiological studies, suggest an association between bladder cancer and exposure to chlorinated surface water; however, these risks are uncertain. The lowest estimate from five selected epidemiological studies of the number of new bladder cancer cases per year attributable to chlorinated surface water is 1,100 cases, while the highest is 9,300 cases. In contrast, toxicological studies yield baseline estimates of 1 to 100 new cancer cases per year attributable to DBPs in surface water. The rule is estimated to reduce DBP levels in finished drinking water by 24% on average. The final DBP Stage I rule was signed in November 1998.

National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule

The regulation for Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment is intended to expand existing public health protections and address concerns about risk trade-offs between pathogens and disinfection byproducts. As reflected in the November, 1998 Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (IESWTR) Regulatory Impact Analysis, EPA estimated the national capital and annualized costs of possible IESWTR provisions would be $759 million and $307 million, respectively. These estimates include costs associated with improved treatment, turbidity monitoring, a disinfection benchmark, and sanitary surveys. Mean estimated *annual* benefits of the provisions range from $348 million to $1.6 billion , depending upon varied baseline and improved Cryptosporidium removal assumptions with corresponding reduced cases of cryptosporidiosis illness ranging from 110,000 to 463,000. The final IESWTR was signed in November 1998.

National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Ground Water Rule

The Safe Drinking Water Act as amended in 1996 directs EPA to promulgate regulations requiring disinfection "as necessary" for ground water systems. The intention is to reduce microbial contamination risk from public water systems relying on groundwater. To determine if treatment is necessary, the rule will establish a framework to identify public water supplies vulnerable to microbial contamination and to develop and implement risk control strategies including but not limited to disinfection. From a public health perspective, the Ground Water Rule will reduce both endemic levels and outbreaks of illness. The economic analyses for this rule are still under development. EPA plans to propose this rule in September 1999.

National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Arsenic

SDWA directs EPA to establish a maximum contaminant level (MCL) as close to the maximum contaminant level goal (MCLG) as feasible, considering treatment efficacy and costs. EPA must list affordable technologies or treatment techniques that achieve compliance with the MCL for three categories of small systems considering the quality of the source water. Furthermore, alternatives to central treatment, such as point-of-use and point-of-entry devices, can be considered for small systems that maintain control over operation and maintenance. At the time of proposal, EPA must seek comment on its analyses of costs of compliance and health risk reduction benefits likely to occur as the result of treatment to comply with the proposed MCL and any alternatives being considered. The cost-benefit analyses are still under development at this time. EPA plans to propose this rule in January 2000.

National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Radon

Pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water Act as amended in 1996, EPA is required to: (1) withdraw the 1991 proposed radon in drinking water rule; (2) work with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a risk assessment for radon in drinking water and assess the health risk reduction benefits associated with various mitigation methods of reducing radon in indoor air; (3) publish a radon health risk reduction and cost analysis for possible radon Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) for public comment, by February, 1999; (4) propose a Maximum Contaminant Level Goal (MCLG) and National Primary Drinking Water Regulation (NPDWR) for radon by August, 1999; and (5) publish an MCLG and Final NPDWR for radon by August, 2000.

EPA is currently developing estimates of the anticipated costs and benefits associated with this regulation. Among other things, EPA will be evaluating the unit risk information (with the input of the National Academy of Sciences), the occurrence of radon in public water systems, the unit costs of various types of radon in water treatment systems, the characterization of the flows associated with "model" systems, the number of systems in various size categories, the costs and benefits associated with the health effects of radon, and models for integrating much of these data. Most of this information and supporting calculations are expected to be available by the time the Health Risk Reduction and Cost Analysis is published (February 1999).

Effluent Guideline for Industrial Laundries

The proposed effluent guidelines rulemaking for the industrial laundries industry would limit the discharges of pollutants into waters of the United States and into publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) by establishing pretreatment standards for existing sources (PSES). The proposed rule would benefit the environment by removing toxic pollutants that have adverse effects on human health and aquatic life. The standards would also reduce potential interference with POTW operations. The proposed PSES limitations would reduce the discharge of pollutants to waters of the U.S. by 5 million pounds per year. EPA estimates that these pollutant reductions would provide several types of benefits including: reduced incidences of cancer, recreational fishing improvements, non-use benefits, and reduced interference with POTW operations. EPA estimates annual benefits in the range of $2.9 million to $10.6 million (1997 dollars). Other benefits that are expected, but have not been expressed in monetary terms, include reduced noncancer health effects, and enhanced recreation other than fishing (e.g. swimming, boating). The estimated total annualized social cost for the standards is $139.4 million (1997 dollars), which incorporates capital costs of $470 million and annual operating and maintenance costs of $86 million using a 7 percent discount rate. EPA plans to issue this final rule in June 1999.

Goal 3: Safe Food

Ground Water and Pesticide Management Plan

(Final Action 09/99). This final regulation would establish Pesticide Management Plans (PMPs) as a new regulatory requirement for certain pesticides. Absent an EPA-approved Plan specifying risk-reduction measures, use of the chemical would be prohibited. The rule would also specify procedures and deadlines for development, approval and modification of plans. EPA anticipates four categories of costs entailed in requiring PMPs. Federal Program Costs are those of administering ground-water protection activities, such as the review of State or Tribal proposals. State Program Costs entail both capital and annual costs. Registrant and user impacts are the economic losses ascribed to the reduced use of the classified pesticides, as well as the costs (to the registrants) of complying with Federal, State and Tribal provisions. Benefits accrue from the reduced levels of pesticide residues in ground water, and a corresponding reduction in: 1) human and ecological risk; and 2) threats to the economic and intrinsic values of the ground-water resource. Enormous uncertainties attend the quantification of these benefits. Because the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) requires that EPA consider drinking water as part of dietary exposure, the Agency is analyzing implications for this regulation.

Pesticide Tolerance Reassessment Program (a series of regulatory actions issued over 10 years)

EPA will reassess pesticide tolerances and exemptions for raw and processed foods established prior to August 3, 1996, to determine whether they meet the Areasonable certainty of no harm@ standard of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA). FFDCA sec. 408(q), as amended by the Food Quality Protection Act, requires that EPA conduct this reassessment on a phased 10-year schedule. Based on its reassessment, EPA will take a series of regulatory actions to modify or revoke tolerances that do not meet the reasonable certainty of no harm standard.

Analysis of costs will be conducted as part of an economic analysis of the revocation/modification actions proposed. The FFDCA allows EPA to consider benefits only in a very limited manner in determining whether to retain or modify a pesticide tolerance. Actions taken as a result of the tolerance reassessment program will ensure that dietary exposures to pesticides will be safe, taking into account aggregate exposure from food, water and non-occupational sources, and considering the cumulative effects of substances have a common mode of toxicity.

Endocrine Disruptor Screening and Testing Program

The Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) requires EPA to screen pesticides for estrogenic effects on human health. The Safe Drinking Water Act authorizes EPA to screen chemicals found in drinking water sources in similar manner. EPA proposed a screening program in August 1998, and FQPA mandated that it be implemented by August 1999 and report to Congress in August 2000. EPA established the Endocrine Disruptor Screening and Testing Advisory Committee (EDSTAC) in October 1996, to provide advice and counsel to the Agency in implementing the screening and testing program. EDSTAC was comprised of 43 members representing industry, government, environmental and public health groups, labor academia, and other interested stakeholders. EPA was represented on EDSTAC by OPPTS, ORD and OW. EDSTAC has held its final meeting in June 1998. The Committee considered human health and ecological effects; estrogenic, androgenic, anti-estrogenic, ani-androgenic and thyroid effects in its deliberations and extended its scope to include industrial chemicals, drinking water contaminants and important mixtures as well as pesticides. EDSTAC will submit its final report to EPA in August 1998. EPA will propose its screening and testing strategy in August 1998 and will propose a more detailed implementation plan for public comment in fall of 1998.

Evidence is continuing to mount that wildlife and humans may be at risk from exposure to chemicals operating through a endocrine mediated pathway. Preliminary studies show decreases on IQ tests and increases in aggression and hyperactivity in children. Severe malformations of the genitals of boys has increased steadily over the last two decades. Although increases in cancers of endocrine sensitive tissues have been reported, no link has been made to show that chemicals are the cause. Wildlife effects linked to specific chemical exposures have been more thoroughly documented in the U.S., Europe, Japan, Canada and Australia. Evidence is sufficient for the U.S. to proceed on a two track strategy; research on the basic science regarding endocrine disruption and screening to identify which chemicals are capable of interacting with the endocrine system. The combination of research and test data developed by this program will enable EPA to take action to reduce chemical risks.

It is too early to project the costs and benefits of this program accurately. However, as a rough estimate, the screening battery is estimated to cost $200,000 per chemical. It is too early to determine how many chemicals will be screened in Tier 1 much less tested in Tier 2. It is also too early to tell the benefits-that is how many chemicals will be identified that are endocrine disruptors and their exposure reduced either by formal risks management or by voluntary exposure reduction or product substitution.

Goal 4: Preventing Pollution in Communities Homes and Workplaces

Proposed Lead Rulemaking Under TSCA Section 402, Lead-Based Paint Activities (Final rule Remodeling & Renovation 09/01; Final Rule Debris 11/00; Final Rule Buildings and Structures).

The Residential Lead-Based Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 (TitleX) amended TSCA by adding a new Title IV. TSCA Section 402, Lead-Based Paint Activities Training and Certification directs EPA to promulgate: (a) regulations governing lead-based paint activities to ensure that individuals engaged in such activities are properly trained, that training programs are accredited, and that contractors engaged in such activities are certified ; (b) a Model State program which may be adopted by any State which seeks to administer and enforce a State Program for the requirements established under TSCA Section 402; (c) a rule addressing lead risks from renovation and remodeling activities or state when no regulation is necessary; and (d) a rule establishing a fee schedule for the lead based paint training, certification, and accreditation activities addressed in the rules developed under TSCA Section 402. Additionally, in response to concerns that high disposal costs would discourage lead abatements, EPA is using its authority under TSCA Section 402 (a) to address the disposal of lead-based paint debris that will result from the lead-based paint activities regulated under TSCA Section 402. To minimize duplication of waste management requirements, EPA is developing a companion RCRA rule to suspend temporarily hazardous waste management regulations applicable to lead-based paint debris which will be subject to the new TSCA standards.

For the Section 402(a)/404(Residential) rule, the costs ($16 million in the initial year, $10 million in subsequent years) have been provided in the final economic impact analysis that was prepared in conjunction with the final rule. For the remainder of the Section 402 rules, costs will be estimated in the draft economic impact analyses that will be prepared for the proposed rules. Since benefits depend on private sector implementation of certain lead hazard abatement activities which are not mandated by any of these rules, benefits will be difficult to quantify.

TSCA Section 403; Identification of Dangerous Levels of Lead (Final Rule 09/99)

TSCA Section 403 requires EPA to promulgate regulations that identify lead-based paint hazards, lead-contaminated dust and lead-contaminated soil. EPA published an interim guidance document in 1995, to provide public and private decision-makers with guidance on identifying an prioritizing lead-based paint hazards for control. This interim guidance will continue to serve as EPA's official policy until the final TSCA Section 403 rule is promulgated. EPA proposed the Section 403 Rule in June 1998. Net benefits to society associated with the proposed standards were estimated to equal $42.5 billion over a fifty year period.

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) Disposal Amendments (Final Rule on Use Authorizations 03/99; Notice/Decisions on Import Issue 09/99)

This rulemaking will make over 90 modification, additions, and deletions to the existing PCB management program under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). A notice of proposed rulemaking was published on December 6, 1994, and covered the manufacture (including import) processing, distribution in commerce, export use, disposal, and marking of PCBs. On Jun 29, 1998, EPA issued a final rule involving the disposal related provisions. The other provisions, regarding use authorizations and imports, will be addressed in separate actions.

EPA projects significant cost savings from authorizations for existing uses and the disposal of large-volume wastes such as PCB-contaminated environmental media. In addition, certain administrative requirements should increase the speed of remediation of contaminated sites and accelerate the removal from use of PCBs. EPA projects minimal implementation costs and is reviewing comments which highlight areas for additional cost savings over the proposal. EPA estimates that millions of tons of PCB-contaminated environmental media will be remediated under this rule, thus preventing large quantities of this long-lived, bioaccoumulating chemical from entering the food chain.

Chemical Right-to-Know (RTK) Initiative

Vice President Gore announced the Chemical RTK Initiative to encourage the provision of information about the toxicity of commercial chemicals. There are three key components to this initiative: (1) baseline toxicity testing for 2,800 widely used commercial chemicals; (2) additional health effects testing for chemicals to which children are disproportionately exposed; and (3) the listing and lowering thresholds for persistent, bioaccumulative, toxic chemicals reported to TRI.

The benefits of the Chemical Right-to-Know Initiative are unknown, but may be substantial in terms of assisting risk management and avoidance decisions. The cost of the baseline testing is approximately $200,000 per chemical. More detailed testing, as envisioned for the Children's Health testing portion of this initiative is expected to impose additional costs.

Goal 5: Better Waste Management, Restoration of Contaminated Waste Sites, and Emergency Response

Revised Standards for Hazardous Waste Combustion Facilities

The Combustion MACT Standards rulemaking was proposed in April 1996, with the final rulemaking currently scheduled for signature in 1999. This is a joint action that invokes the authorities of both the Clean Air Act (CAA) and RCRA. The Final Rule will set technology-based emission limits for hazardous waste incinerators, cement kilns, and LWAKs, using the Maximum Achievable Control Technologies (MACT) provisions under Sec. 112 of the CAA.

Aggregate compliance costs for all sources to meet the final recommended standards are estimated to average about $75 million per year. Individual combustion systems are likely to

experience annual compliance costs ranging from $244,000 to $1.0 million, depending upon equipment retrofit requirements. An estimated two (2) cement kilns and approximately thirteen (13) on-site incinerators may stop burning hazardous waste in response to implementation of the final recommended standards.

The MACT standards are expected to provide both human health and ecological benefits. Preliminary benefits have been monetized for both cancer and non-cancer effects. Ecological benefits have not been monetized. Human health benefits for the final standards are currently estimated at about $25 million per year. Other benefits potentially attributable to the final Rule, such as improved visibility were not estimated.

Goal 7: Community Right-to-Know

TRI; Addition of Oil and Gas Exploration and Production to the Toxic Release Inventory (Final Rule 12/00)

The original Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) required reporting from facilities in Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes 20-39. These SIC codes cover facilities whose primary economic activity was classified as manufacturing. This requirement was specified under the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act (EPCRA). EPCRA provides the Administrator with the authority to add or delete SIC codes and the discretion to add particular facilities based on a broad set of factors. EPA has recently expanded this original list of covered industries. EPA began additional analyses to determine whether facilities which perform exploration and production of oil and gas should also be added to the list of facilities covered under EPCRA. No final decision on this issue has been made.

Based on the current status of the project, anticipated costs are unknown. Estimated costs for compliance with EPCRA reporting requirements are available, but until further evaluation is completed no estimates are available for the impact of the resulting requirements on any industries that may be added. Generally, anticipated benefits will be in the form of making available more complete information regarding the release and disposition of toxic chemicals in the environment.

TRI; Chemical Expansion; Finalization of Deferred Chemicals (Final Action 12/00)

On November 30, 1994, EPA added 286 chemicals and chemical categories to EPCRA Section 313 list, including 39 chemicals as part of two delineated categories. Each chemical and chemical category was found to meet the statutory criteria described in EPCRA. At this time, EPA deferred final action on 40 chemicals and one chemical category until a later date. These were deferred because the comments received on them raised difficult technical or policy issues which required additional time to address. EPA chose not to delay final action on the 286 chemical and chemical categories because of the additional time needed to address the issues surrounding the smaller group of 40 chemicals and one chemical category; rather, EPA believed it to be in the spirit

of right-to-know to proceed with the final rulemaking of the additional chemicals and chemical categories.

The final total costs are not yet known, since the final listing decisions have not yet been made. The addition of any of these chemicals or the chemical category will result in additional costs to the reporting community. The additional information reported in TRI increases the public's knowledge regarding the levels of pollutants released to the environment and pathways of exposure. It allows the public to make informed decisions on where to work and live; enhances the ability of corporate lenders and purchasers to more accurately determine a facility's potential liabilities; and assists Federal, State, and local authorities making better decisions on acceptable levels of toxics in communities.

TRI: Pollution Prevention Act Information Requirements (Final Action 06/00)

The Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (PPA) requires the addition of several data elements to the Toxic Chemical Release Inventory (TRI) reporting requirements. It requires owners or operators of certain facilities that manufacture, process, or otherwise use listed toxic chemicals to annually report their releases of these chemicals to each environmental medium. The PPA mandates that facilities also report on source reduction and recycling activities relating to the toxic chemicals beginning with the 1991 reporting year. Since 1991 covered facilities have been providing this information to EPA in Section 8A, Source Reduction and Recycling Activities, of EPA Form R. EPA's proposed regulation would provide definitions and instructions for reporting the PPA data elements on the EPA Form R.

Because of the inconsistencies in the PPA data currently reported on the Form R, communities are unable to accurately compare the risks related to release and recycling activities between different facilities. By providing covered facilities with clear guidance for reporting this information, the public will be better equipped to determine and compare the risks associated with toxic chemicals being released and managed in their community.

EPA estimates industry currently incurs a cost of $61.3 million annually to report PPA data on Form R. This estimate does not include the costs related to the seven industries newly subject to EPCRA 313. The cost to process source reduction and waste management data equals $2.7 million each year. This action is not expected to add to these existing costs, and may actually result in a reduction to the overall industry burden and costs.

TRI; Reporting Threshold Amendment; Toxic Chemicals Release Reporting; Community Right-to-Know (Final Action 09/99)

The Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) currently requires reporting from facilities which manufacture or process at least 25,000 pounds of a listed chemical, or otherwise use 10,000 pounds of a listed chemical. These thresholds were initially established under the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-know Act (EPCRA). EPCRA gives the Administrator the power to establish a threshold amount for a toxic chemical different from the amount established by paragraph (1) and

that such altered thresholds may be based on classes of chemicals. EPA is considering lowering the thresholds for those chemicals which it determines to be highly toxic at very low dose levels and/or have physical, chemical, or biological properties that make the chemicals persist for extended periods in the environment, and/or bioaccumulate through the food chain. Persistent bioaccumulative toxic chemicals are of particular concern in ecosystems such as the Great Lakes Basin due to the long retention time of the individual lakes and the cycling of the chemicals from on component of the ecosystem to another. EPA is currently conducting analysis to determine which chemicals present the specific problems described above, and to determine what the altered threshold value(s) should be.

Currently communities do not have access to TRI data on chemicals that, although released in relatively small quantities, pose a potential risk to human health and the environment because they persist and bioaccumulate. By lowering the reporting thresholds for such chemicals the public will be able to determine if such chemicals are being released into their communities and whether any action should be taken to reduce potential risks.

The anticipated costs related to this action are unknown at present. At this point the Agency is still unsure how low to set reporting thresholds or for what specific list of chemicals the lower reporting thresholds should apply. The information reported in TRI increases the knowledge levels of pollutants released to the environment and pathways to exposure; allows the public to make informed decisions on where to work and live; enhances the ability of corporate lenders and purchasers to more accurately determine a facility's potential liability; and assists Federal, State, and local authorities in making better decisions on acceptable levels of toxics in communities.

TRI: Review of Chemicals on the Original TRI List (Final Rule 12/00)

When TRI was established by Congress in 1986, the statutory language placed 309 chemicals and 20 categories of chemicals on the TRI list; that is referred to as the original TRI list. The chemicals on the original list were taken from two existing lists of toxic substances: the Maryland Chemical Inventory Report List of Toxic or Hazardous Substances, and the New Jersey Environmental Hazardous Substances list. This action constitutes the first systematic review of toxicology and environmental data for all the chemicals on the original TRI list to determine whether data for those chemicals conform with the statutory criteria for listing of chemicals on TRI. Chemicals for which data do not meet the statutory criteria will be delisted.

TRI provides information to industry, governments and the public on chemicals that can cause harm to health or the environment. The review of toxicology and environmental data for all chemicals on the original TRI list will ensure that the list focuses only on those chemicals that pose meaningful possibilities of risks to human health or the environment, increasing the effectiveness of the TRI.

The anticipated costs to industry related to this action are unknown at present. Costs to industry would be reduced if chemicals are removed from the TRI list. Benefits would result from any reduction in reporting burden as a result of the delisting of a chemical.

NON-APPROPRIATED FUNDS

OVERVIEW

Non-appropriated funds are monies which pay for discreet Agency activities supported by fees. These funds are available to the Agency and do not require an appropriation. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has two accounts for such non-appropriated funds. These are 1) the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Revolving Fund and 2) the Revolving Fund for Certification and Other Services.

The 1988 amendments to FIFRA required the Agency to review and reregister all pesticides that were registered before November 1984. To supplement appropriated funding for the Pesticide Registration Program, two types of fees were established on the pesticide industry, Federal, state and local governments: (1) a Reregistration Fee and (2) an annual Maintenance Fee. Fee receipts are deposited into the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Revolving Fund available to EPA without annual appropriation. For this reason, EPA does not request dollars from this fund, commonly called the "FIFRA Fund", in the annual President's Budget. The Reregistration Fee expired in 1992, but Maintenance Fees will continue until 2001. From 1999 to the year 2000, $16,000,000 in annual Maintenance Fees will be collected and in the year 2001, $14,000,000 will be collected. EPA continues to fund part of the Pesticide Reregistration Program through its annual appropriations.

The Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) of 1963 requires EPA to establish tolerance levels and exemptions for pesticide residues on raw agricultural commodities. Under section 408 of FFDCA, the Agency is authorized to collect fees to recover the costs of processing petitions for these pesticide tolerances. The fees are paid by companies/registrants requesting establishment of a permanent or temporary pesticide tolerance at the time of the request and work is not begun until verification of the fees receipt is made. Fee receipts, until 1997, were deposited into the Revolving Fund for Certification and Other Services, commonly called the "Tolerance Fund" which are available to EPA without an annual appropriation. With enactment of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, fee receipts are now deposited into the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Revolving Fund. FQPA also requires the reassessment of all pesticide tolerances established before FQPA enactment. This new task is to be supported in the aggregate by a restructured tolerance fee, which will cover both tolerance petitions and tolerance reassessments. For 2000, the Agency will work to finalize the new fee regulation scheduled to be proposed in 1999. In 2000, the amount the Agency will collect will depend on the timing of the promulgation of the tolerance fee rule.

PROGRAM AND ACTIVITY HIGHLIGHTS

Reregistration and Expedited Processing Revolving Fund

Beginning in 1997, this non-appropriated revolving fund included $2,000,000 in new tolerance fees collected under the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, plus the collection of the annual Pesticide Maintenance Fees. In 2000, estimated fee collections for the annual maintenance fee will be $16,000,000. In 2000, EPA will promulgate the needed rules to increase tolerance fees to ensure that the tolerance setting process will be as self-supporting as possible.

The Agency's emphasis on pesticide reregistrations will continue in 2000 and is reflected in the appropriated budget request to complete twenty (20) Reregistration Eligibility Decisions. In addition, the Agency continues to establish tolerances for pesticide residues in or on food for feed crops in the United States under The Food Quality Protection Act of 1996. The Agency expects to conduct 105 tolerance petition actions in 2000.

Revolving Fund for Certification and Other Services

The Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 requires new tolerance fees be deposited into the Registration and Expedited Processing Revolving (FIFRA) Fund. In 1999, tolerance fees are no longer deposited in the Revolving Fund for Certification and Other Services. The Agency expects to outlay any remaining fund balance in 1999.

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Acid Rain -CASTNet	$4,000.0	$4,000.0
Science & Technology	$4,000.0	$4,000.0
Acid Rain -Program Implementation	$9,951.3	$12,183.3
Environmental Program & Management	$9,951.3	$12,183.3
Administrative Law	$2,324.3	$2,193.4
Environmental Program & Management	$2,324.3	$2,193.4
Agricultural Worker Protection	$4,365.2	$5,738.1
Environmental Program & Management	$4,365.2	$5,738.1
Air Toxics Research	$19,681.7	$20,561.6
Science & Technology	$19,681.7	$20,561.6
Air,State,Local and Tribal Assistance Grants: Other Air Grants	$155,901.8	$167,222.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$155,901.8	$167,222.0
Assessments	$87,738.8	$88,970.3
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$87,738.8	$88,970.3
Assistance Agreement Audits	$6,830.5	$6,632.0
Inspector General	$3,428.7	$3,230.2
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$3,401.8	$3,401.8
Assistance Agreement Investigations	$2,650.4	$2,728.4
Inspector General	$2,650.4	$2,728.4
ATSDR Superfund Support	$76,000.0	$64,000.0
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$76,000.0	$64,000.0
Brownfields	$91,538.9	$91,667.5
Environmental Program & Management	$1,265.2	$1,393.8
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$90,273.7	$90,273.7
CCTI: RESEARCH	$10,000.0	$0.0
Science & Technology	$10,000.0	$0.0

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Center for Environmental Statistics (CEIS)	$3,965.8	$8,054.4
Environmental Program & Management	$3,965.8	$8,054.4
Chesapeake Bay (CWAP)	$19,630.1	$18,899.3
Environmental Program & Management	$19,630.1	$18,899.3
Childrens Health, Program Development and Coordination	$6,157.5	$5,744.8
Environmental Program & Management	$6,157.5	$5,744.8
Civil Enforcement	$84,324.4	$91,198.3
Environmental Program & Management	$81,763.9	$88,548.7
Science & Technology	$589.9	$574.6
Oil Spill Response	$1,234.0	$1,334.7
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$736.6	$740.3
Civil Enforcement - AFO (CWAP-related activity)	$0.0	$1,462.0
Environmental Program & Management	$0.0	$1,462.0
Civil Rights/Title VI Compliance	$1,637.1	$1,331.7
Environmental Program & Management	$1,637.1	$1,331.7
Clean Air Partnership Fund	$0.0	$200,000.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$0.0	$200,000.0
Climate Change Research	$16,670.5	$22,833.6
Science & Technology	$16,670.5	$22,833.6
Climate Change Technology Initiative: Buildings	$38,800.0	$80,100.0
Environmental Program & Management	$38,800.0	$80,100.0
Climate Change Technology Initiative: Carbon Removal	$0.0	$3,400.0
Environmental Program & Management	$0.0	$3,400.0
Climate Change Technology Initiative: Industry	$18,600.0	$55,600.0
Environmental Program & Management	$18,600.0	$55,600.0

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Climate Change Technology Initiative: State and Local Climate Change	$2,900.0	$5,000.0
Environmental Program & Management	$2,900.0	$5,000.0
Climate Change Technology Initiative: Transportation	$31,750.0	$61,900.0
Environmental Program & Management	$4,800.0	$12,000.0
Science & Technology	$26,950.0	$49,900.0
Coastal Environmental Monitoring	$0.0	$6,549.0
Science & Technology	$0.0	$6,549.0
Common Sense Initiative	$7,091.3	$6,141.4
Environmental Program & Management	$6,224.3	$5,519.6
Science & Technology	$867.0	$621.8
Community Right to Know (Title III)	$4,683.5	$5,099.4
Environmental Program & Management	$4,683.5	$5,099.4
Compliance Assistance and Centers	$23,490.2	$18,397.2
Environmental Program & Management	$23,118.7	$17,865.5
Oil Spill Response	$274.8	$342.7
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$96.7	$189.0
Compliance Incentives	$4,075.6	$3,646.0
Environmental Program & Management	$3,865.2	$3,414.0
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$210.4	$232.0
Compliance Monitoring	$56,838.9	$64,170.3
Environmental Program & Management	$48,472.1	$54,347.0
Science & Technology	$4,568.4	$4,758.5
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$3,798.4	$5,064.8
Contract Audits	$4,950.6	$5,381.6
Inspector General	$4,245.1	$4,673.1
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$705.5	$708.5
Contract and Procurement Investigations	$2,913.0	$2,975.8

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Inspector General	$1,844.1	$1,906.9
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$1,068.9	$1,068.9
Contracts Management	$24,986.0	$27,503.9
Environmental Program & Management	$16,232.7	$16,833.7
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	$69.6	$69.6
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$8,683.7	$10,600.6
Criminal Enforcement	$33,786.5	$35,635.4
Environmental Program & Management	$23,671.0	$25,068.9
Science & Technology	$3,327.7	$3,425.4
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$6,787.8	$7,141.1
Design for the Environment	$4,554.0	$3,886.1
Environmental Program & Management	$4,554.0	$3,886.1
Drinking Water Consumer Awareness	$1,365.8	$1,467.9
Environmental Program & Management	$1,365.8	$1,467.9
Drinking Water Implementation	$31,688.0	$31,803.8
Environmental Program & Management	$31,688.0	$31,803.8
Drinking Water Regulations	$33,886.2	$43,484.9
Environmental Program & Management	$31,767.3	$41,312.9
Science & Technology	$2,118.9	$2,172.0
Effluent Guidelines (CWAP)	$22,365.8	$23,193.0
Environmental Program & Management	$22,365.8	$23,193.0
EMPACT	$14,047.7	$17,983.3
Environmental Program & Management	$7,658.0	$10,744.1
Science & Technology	$6,389.7	$7,239.2
Employee Integrity Investigations	$953.4	$981.6
Inspector General	$953.4	$981.6
Endocrine Disruptor Research	$12,230.0	$12,735.3

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Science & Technology	$12,230.0	$12,735.3
Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program	$4,106.8	$7,668.9
Environmental Program & Management	$4,106.8	$7,668.9
Enforcement Training	$4,435.8	$5,117.2
Environmental Program & Management	$3,774.7	$4,456.1
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$661.1	$661.1
Environment and Trade	$4,514.6	$4,236.8
Environmental Program & Management	$4,514.6	$4,236.8
Environmental Education	$7,767.6	$8,426.1
Environmental Program & Management	$7,767.6	$8,426.1
Environmental Finance Center Grants (EFC)	$1,065.0	$940.0
Environmental Program & Management	$1,065.0	$940.0
Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program, EMAP	$33,255.0	$33,955.0
Science & Technology	$33,255.0	$33,955.0
Environmental Technology Verification (ETV)	$6,990.5	$7,749.5
Science & Technology	$6,990.5	$7,749.5
Existing Chemical Data, Screening, Testing and Management	$12,870.0	$23,045.6
Environmental Program & Management	$12,870.0	$23,045.6
Facility Operations: Agency Rental/ Direct Lease	$170,571.8	$193,223.6
Environmental Program & Management	$133,357.0	$153,148.0
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	$723.3	$723.3
Oil Spill Response	$511.7	$511.7
Inspector General	$3,236.6	$0.0
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$32,743.2	$38,840.6
Facility Operations: Agency Utilities	$10,015.2	$11,567.9
Environmental Program & Management	$9,985.7	$11,538.4
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$29.5	$29.5

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Facility Operations: Repairs and Improvements	$15,428.0	$20,410.5
Building and Facilities	$15,428.0	$20,410.5
Facility Operations: Security	$12,962.2	$13,037.2
Environmental Program & Management	$12,219.7	$12,294.7
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$742.5	$742.5
Federal Air Toxics Standards	$17,620.3	$14,902.9
Environmental Program & Management	$17,620.3	$14,902.9
Federal Facilities	$28,641.6	$28,720.4
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$28,641.6	$28,720.4
Federal Preparedness	$11,060.2	$11,060.2
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$11,060.2	$11,060.2
Financial Statement Audits	$4,187.5	$4,296.2
Inspector General	$3,300.6	$3,409.3
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$886.9	$886.9
Global Toxics	$932.3	$2,967.0
Environmental Program & Management	$932.3	$2,967.0
GLOBE	$0.0	$1,000.0
Environmental Program & Management	$0.0	$1,000.0
Grants Management	$8,568.8	$9,455.7
Environmental Program & Management	$7,331.5	$8,098.4
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	$211.3	$211.3
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$1,026.0	$1,146.0
Grants to States for Lead Risk Reduction	$13,712.2	$13,712.2
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$13,712.2	$13,712.2
Great Lakes (CWAP)	$5,381.6	$4,366.3
Environmental Program & Management	$5,381.6	$4,366.3

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Great Lakes National Program Office (CWAP)	$14,614.6	$13,367.5
Environmental Program & Management	$14,614.6	$13,367.5
Gulf of Mexico (CWAP)	$3,798.9	$4,290.6
Environmental Program & Management	$3,798.9	$4,290.6
Hazardous Substance Research:Hazardous Substance Research Centers	$1,067.2	$1,092.5
Science & Technology	$1,067.2	$0.0
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$0.0	$1,092.5
Hazardous Substance Research:Superfund Innovative Technology	$7,663.1	$7,114.6
Science & Technology	$7,663.1	$0.0
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$0.0	$7,114.6
Hazardous Waste Research	$6,619.3	$7,249.6
Science & Technology	$6,619.3	$7,249.6
Human Health Research	$50,323.8	$55,836.7
Science & Technology	$50,323.8	$55,332.7
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$0.0	$504.0
Human Resources Management	$21,932.0	$24,139.3
Environmental Program & Management	$19,486.1	$22,169.1
Science & Technology	$326.0	$226.0
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	$36.3	$36.2
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$2,083.6	$1,708.0
Immediate Office of the Administrator	$2,791.3	$3,729.8
Environmental Program & Management	$2,791.3	$3,729.8
Indoor Air Research	$2,836.1	$0.0
Science & Technology	$2,836.1	$0.0
Indoor Environments : Asthma	$1,135.5	$12,323.7
Environmental Program & Management	$1,135.5	$11,346.9
Science & Technology	$0.0	$976.8

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Indoor Environments: ETS	$1,050.0	$2,194.3
Environmental Program & Management	$1,050.0	$2,194.3
Indoor Environments: Schools	$2,921.0	$9,946.7
Environmental Program & Management	$2,886.0	$9,119.2
Science & Technology	$35.0	$827.5
Information Technology Management	$22,963.2	$24,803.4
Environmental Program & Management	$19,065.7	$21,145.0
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$3,897.5	$3,658.4
International Capacity Building	$7,400.0	$10,400.0
Environmental Program & Management	$7,400.0	$10,400.0
Lake Champlain (CWAP)	$2,000.0	$1,000.0
Environmental Program & Management	$2,000.0	$1,000.0
Lead Risk Reduction Program	$16,911.3	$14,986.3
Environmental Program & Management	$16,911.3	$14,986.3
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST)Cooperative Agreements	$59,883.0	$58,700.7
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	$59,883.0	$58,700.7
Long Island Sound (CWAP)	$900.0	$500.0
Environmental Program & Management	$900.0	$500.0
Mobile Sources	$47,824.5	$51,521.6
Science & Technology	$47,824.5	$51,521.6
Multilateral Fund	$11,362.0	$21,000.0
Environmental Program & Management	$11,362.0	$21,000.0
National Estuaries Program/Coastal Watersheds (CWAP)	$16,544.3	$17,048.8
Environmental Program & Management	$16,544.3	$17,048.8
National Nonpoint Source Program Implementation (CWAP)	$15,476.7	$15,198.8

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Environmental Program & Management	$15,476.7	$15,198.8
National Program chemicals: PCBs, Asbestos, Fibers,and Dioxin	$3,011.9	$3,289.2
Environmental Program & Management	$3,011.9	$3,289.2
NEPA Implementation	$9,401.6	$9,697.7
Environmental Program & Management	$9,401.6	$9,697.7
New Chemical Review	$13,409.6	$13,926.9
Environmental Program & Management	$13,409.6	$13,926.9
New Construction :RTP New Building Project	$36,000.0	$49,070.0
Environmental Program & Management	$0.0	$5,241.0
Science & Technology	$0.0	$7,129.0
Building and Facilities	$36,000.0	$36,700.0
New Construction: New Headquaters Project	$15,945.3	$18,396.3
Environmental Program & Management	$8,367.3	$9,918.3
Building and Facilities	$5,520.0	$5,520.0
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$2,058.0	$2,958.0
NIEHS Superfund Support	$60,000.0	$48,526.7
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$60,000.0	$48,526.7
NPDES Program (CWAP)	$35,142.8	$46,338.8
Environmental Program & Management	$35,142.8	$46,338.8
Oil Spills Preparedness, Prevention and Response	$11,988.0	$12,437.5
Oil Spill Response	$11,988.0	$12,437.5
Other Federal Agency Superfund Support	$10,000.0	$11,035.0
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$10,000.0	$11,035.0
Pacific Northwest (CWAP)	$713.6	$823.9
Environmental Program & Management	$713.6	$823.9
Particulate Matter Monitoring Network (non-grant)	$25,000.0	$14,613.0

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Environmental Program & Management	$7,000.0	$6,613.0
Science & Technology	$18,000.0	$8,000.0
Particulate Matter Monitoring Network Grants	$50,700.0	$42,535.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$50,700.0	$42,535.0
Particulate Matter Research	$55,656.8	$61,855.6
Science & Technology	$55,656.8	$61,855.6
Partnership with Industrial and Other Countries	$6,176.4	$8,234.0
Environmental Program & Management	$6,176.4	$8,234.0
Pesticide Applicator Certification and Training	$5,313.6	$6,765.6
Environmental Program & Management	$5,313.6	$6,765.6
Pesticide Registration+A62	$30,157.2	$34,687.1
Environmental Program & Management	$27,716.9	$32,812.2
Science & Technology	$2,440.3	$1,874.9
Pesticide Reregistration	$35,289.2	$38,102.7
Environmental Program & Management	$32,640.2	$36,091.8
Science & Technology	$2,649.0	$2,010.9
Rereg. & Exped. Proc. Rev Fund	$0.0	$0.0
Pesticide Residue Tolerance Reassessments	$9,540.8	$10,844.0
Environmental Program & Management	$9,429.7	$10,726.6
Science & Technology	$111.1	$117.4
Rereg. & Exped. Proc. Rev Fund	$0.0	$0.0
Pesticides Program Implementation Grant	$13,114.6	$13,114.6
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$13,114.6	$13,114.6
Pfiesteria (CWAP)	$2,500.0	$500.0
Environmental Program & Management	$2,500.0	$500.0
Planning and Resource Management	$69,120.1	$71,581.6
Environmental Program & Management	$41,098.4	$42,333.2

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	$720.9	$694.9
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$27,300.8	$28,553.5
Pollution Prevention Incentive Grants to States	$5,999.5	$5,999.5
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$5,999.5	$5,999.5
Pollution Prevention Program	$8,872.3	$9,581.2
Environmental Program & Management	$8,872.3	$9,581.2
Program Audits	$10,264.4	$10,509.6
Inspector General	$7,283.3	$7,528.5
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$2,981.1	$2,981.1
Program Integrity Investigations	$911.5	$927.8
Inspector General	$439.8	$456.1
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$471.7	$471.7
Project XL	$6,941.3	$7,143.1
Environmental Program & Management	$6,941.3	$7,143.1
RCRA Corrective Action	$18,167.4	$22,755.5
Environmental Program & Management	$18,167.4	$22,755.5
RCRA Permitting	$15,388.6	$16,773.0
Environmental Program & Management	$15,388.6	$16,773.0
RCRA State Grants	$98,598.2	$98,602.5
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$98,598.2	$98,602.5
Recycling	$4,980.8	$5,079.3
Environmental Program & Management	$4,980.8	$5,079.3
Regional Geographic Program	$8,070.6	$11,780.5
Environmental Program & Management	$8,070.6	$11,780.5
Regional Management	$42,535.0	$42,818.4
Environmental Program & Management	$30,303.6	$30,937.7

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$12,231.4	$11,880.7
Regional Program Infrastructure	$65,373.2	$71,556.0
Environmental Program & Management	$46,303.5	$53,414.1
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	$310.3	$285.4
Oil Spill Response	$26.1	$26.2
Inspector General	$582.5	$0.0
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$18,150.8	$17,830.3
Regional Science and Technology	$6,021.0	$7,659.8
Environmental Program & Management	$2,923.1	$4,371.6
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$3,097.9	$3,288.2
Reinventing Environmental Information (REI)	$15,054.9	$34,783.3
Environmental Program & Management	$15,054.9	$34,783.3
Research (CWAP-related activity)	$1,406.0	$6,757.8
Science & Technology	$1,406.0	$6,757.8
Reinvention Programs, Development and Coordination	$4,334.1	$4,378.1
Environmental Program & Management	$4,334.1	$4,378.1
Risk Management Plans	$7,258.3	$11,804.6
Environmental Program & Management	$7,258.3	$11,804.6
Rural Water Technical Assistance	$13,050.0	$688.0
Environmental Program & Management	$13,050.0	$688.0
Safe Drinking Water Research	$47,728.1	$41,468.2
Science & Technology	$47,728.1	$41,468.2
SBREFA	$760.3	$777.3
Environmental Program & Management	$760.3	$777.3
Small Business Ombudsman	$1,110.3	$1,120.3
Environmental Program & Management	$1,110.3	$1,120.3

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Small, Minority, Women-Owned Business Assistance	$2,064.4	$2,338.4
Environmental Program & Management	$2,064.4	$2,338.4
Source Reduction	$2,728.8	$3,073.4
Environmental Program & Management	$2,728.8	$3,073.4
Source Water Protection (CWAP-related activity)	$11,685.8	$11,501.9
Environmental Program & Management	$11,685.8	$11,501.9
South Florida/Everglades (CWAP)	$3,099.3	$3,084.6
Environmental Program & Management	$3,099.3	$3,084.6
State Nonpoint Source Grants (CWAP)	$200,000.0	$200,000.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$200,000.0	$200,000.0
State PWSS Grants	$93,780.5	$93,780.5
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$93,780.5	$93,780.5
State Pesticides Enforcement Grants	$19,511.4	$19,911.6
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$19,511.4	$19,911.6
State Pollution Control Grants (Section 106) (CWAP)	$115,529.3	$115,529.3
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$115,529.3	$115,529.3
State Radon Grants	$8,158.0	$8,158.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$8,158.0	$8,158.0
State Toxics Enforcement Grants	$7,364.2	$7,364.2
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$7,364.2	$7,364.2
State Underground Injection Control Grants	$10,500.0	$10,500.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$10,500.0	$10,500.0
State Water Quality Cooperative Agreements (CWAP)	$19,000.0	$19,000.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$19,000.0	$19,000.0
State Wetlands Program Grants (CWAP)	$15,000.0	$15,000.0

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$15,000.0	$15,000.0
Superfund - Cost Recovery	$30,494.1	$30,494.1
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$30,494.1	$30,494.1
Superfund - Justice Support	$29,000.0	$28,663.5
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$29,000.0	$28,663.5
Superfund - Maximize PRP Involvement (including reforms)	$89,473.6	$89,234.5
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$89,473.6	$89,234.5
Superfund Remedial Actions	$588,190.0	$592,842.5
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$588,190.0	$592,842.5
Superfund Removal Actions	$199,419.1	$207,399.9
Hazardous Substance Superfund	$199,419.1	$207,399.9
Sustainable Development Challenge Grants	$4,701.8	$4,714.8
Environmental Program & Management	$4,701.8	$4,714.8
Toxic Release Inventory / Right-to-Know (RtK)	$19,799.6	$18,811.5
Environmental Program & Management	$19,799.6	$18,811.5
Tribal Capacity	$3,812.7	$3,894.9
Environmental Program & Management	$3,812.7	$3,894.9
Tribal General Assistance Grants	$42,585.4	$42,585.4
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$42,585.4	$42,585.4
Tropospheric Ozone Research+A82	$20,083.4	$7,217.9
Science & Technology	$20,083.4	$7,217.9
UIC Program	$11,744.7	$11,815.9
Environmental Program & Management	$11,744.7	$11,815.9
Underground Storage Tanks (UST)	$6,077.9	$6,345.3
Environmental Program & Management	$6,077.9	$6,345.3

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Urban Environmental Quality and Human Health	$0.0	$3,395.0
Environmental Program & Management	$0.0	$3,395.0
U.S. - Mexico Border	$4,929.4	$5,056.3
Environmental Program & Management	$4,929.4	$5,056.3
UST State Grants	$10,544.7	$11,944.7
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$10,544.7	$11,944.7
Waste Combustion	$7,346.7	$7,297.7
Environmental Program & Management	$7,346.7	$7,297.7
Waste Minimization	$2,195.3	$2,943.2
Environmental Program & Management	$2,195.3	$2,943.2
Water Infrastructure: Alaska Native Villages	$30,000.0	$15,000.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$30,000.0	$15,000.0
Water Infrastructure:Boston Harbor	$50,000.0	$0.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$50,000.0	$0.0
Water Infrastructure:Bristol County	$2,610.0	$3,000.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$2,610.0	$3,000.0
Water Infrastructure:Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CW-SRF)	$1,350,000.	$800,000.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$1,350,000.	$800,000.0
Water Infrastructure:Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DW-SRF)	$775,000.0	$825,000.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$775,000.0	$825,000.0
Water Infrastructure:Mexico Border	$50,000.0	$100,000.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$50,000.0	$100,000.0
Water Infrastructure:New Orleans	$6,525.0	$10,000.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	$6,525.0	$10,000.0

Key Programs by Appropriation
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request
Water Quality Criteria and Standards (CWAP)	$17,842.5	$22,280.7
Environmental Program & Management	$17,842.5	$22,280.7
Watershed Research	$8,376.1	$8,478.6
Science & Technology	$8,376.1	$8,478.6
Wetlands (CWAP)	$16,110.6	$18,124.5
Environmental Program & Management	$16,110.6	$18,124.5

STATE and TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Grant	FY 1998 ENACTED	FY 1999 ENACTED	FY 2000 PRES BUD
Air & Radiation			
State and Local Assistance	$181,933.0	$195,533.0	$198,690.0
Tribal Assistance	$10,168.8	$11,068.8	$11,068.8
Radon	$8,158.0	$8,158.0	$8,158.0
	$200,259.8	$214,759.8	$217,916.8
Water			
Pollution Control (Section 106)	$95,529.3	$115,529.3	$115,529.3
Nonpoint Source	$105,000.0	$200,000.0	$200,000.0
Wetlands Program	$15,000.0	$15,000.0	$15,000.0
Water Quality Cooperative Agrmts	$20,000.0	$19,000.0	$19,000.0
	$235,529.30	$349,529.3	$349,529.3
Drinking Water			
PWSS	$93,780.5	$93,780.5	$93,780.5
UIC	$10,500.0	$10,500.0	$10,500.0
	$104,280.5	$104,280.5	$104,280.5
Hazardous Waste			
H.W. Financial Assistance	$98,598.2	$98,598.2	$98,598.2
Underground Storage Tanks	$10,544.7	$10,544.7	$11,944.7
	$109,142.9	$109,142.9	$110,542.9
Pesticides & Toxics			
Pesticides Program Implementation	$13,114.6	$13,114.6	$13,114.6
Lead Grants	$13,712.2	$13,712.2	$13,712.2
	$26,826.8	$26,826.8	$26,826.8
Multimedia			
Pollution Prevention	$5,999.5	$5,999.5	$5,999.5
Pesticides Enforcement	$17,511.6	$19,511.7	$19,911.6
Toxics Enforcement	$6,864.2	$7,364.2	$7,364.2
Indian General Assistance Program	$38,585.4	$42,585.3	$42,585.4
	$68,960.7	$75,460.7	$75,860.7
TOTALS	**$745,000.0**	**$880,000.0**	**$884,957.0**

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Object Classification
(Dollars in Millions)

	Account and Object Class	Actuals 1998	Estimate 1999	Request 2000
Science and Technology				
	Direct obligations			
	Personnel compensation	183	182	199
12.10	Travel and transportation of persons	6	5	5
12.20	Transportation of things	1	1	1
12.33	Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges	5	5	5
12.40	Printing and reproduction	1	1	1
12.51	Advisory and assistance services	6	7	7
12.52	Other services	26	124	17
12.53	Purchases of goods and services from Government accounts	43	75	45
12.54	Operation and maintenance of facilities	10	11	11
12.55	Research and development contracts	68	75	70
12.57	Operation and maintenance of equipment	20	22	20
12.60	Supplies and materials	10	11	10
13.10	Equipment	28	30	30
14.10	Grants, subsidies, and contributions	220	235	221
19.90	Subtotal, Direct obligations	627	784	642
	Reimbursable obligations	53	50	47
	TOTAL OBLIGATIONS	680	834	689
Oil Spill Response				
	Direct obligations			
	Personnel Compensation	6	8	9
12.31	Rental payments to GSA	1	1	1
12.52	Other services	6	2	2
12.53	Purchases of goods and services from Government accounts	1	1	1
12.55	Research and development contracts	1	1	1
14.10	Grants, subsidies, and contributions	2	2	2
19.90	Subtotal, Direct obligations	17	15	16
	Reimbursable obligations	25	40	40
	TOTAL OBLIGATIONS	42	55	56

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Object Classification
(Dollars in Millions)

	Account and Object Class	Actuals 1998	Estimate 1999	Request 2000
Environmental Programs and Management				
	Direct obligations			
	Personnel compensation	830	1001	1052
12.10	Travel and transportation of persons	28	22	28
12.20	Transportation of things	2	2	2
12.31	Rental payments to GSA	106	112	116
12.32	Rental payments to others	12	21	22
12.33	Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges	13	10	10
12.40	Printing and reproduction	10	8	8
12.51	Advisory and assistance services	39	31	32
12.52	Other services	353	416	408
12.53	Purchases of goods and services from Government accounts	83	66	68
12.54	Operation and maintenance of facilities	15	12	12
12.55	Research and development contracts	1	1	1
12.57	Operation and maintenance of equipment	31	24	25
12.60	Supplies and materials	12	9	9
13.10	Equipment	42	33	34
14.10	Grants, subsidies, and contributions	270	213	220
19.90	Subtotal, Direct obligations	1847	1981	2047
	Reimbursable obligations	36	80	79
	Below reporting threshold	1	1	1
	TOTAL OBLIGATIONS	1884	2062	2127
Working Capital Fund				
	Reimbursable obligations			
21.11	Full-time permanent	4	4	4
21.21	Civilian personnel benefits	1	1	1
22.20	Transportation of things	2	1	1
22.33	Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges	22	22	22
22.52	Other services	17	31	16
22.57	Operation and maintenance of equipment	52	52	52
23.10	Equipment	12	10	10
	TOTAL OBLIGATIONS	110	121	106

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Object Classification
(Dollars in Millions)

	Account and Object Class	Actuals 1998	Estimate 1999	Request 2000
Hazardous Substance Superfund				
	Direct obligations			
	Personnel compensation	240	317	256
12.10	Travel and transportation of persons	11	10	12
12.20	Transportation of things	1	1	1
12.31	Rental payments to GSA	30	29	30
12.32	Rental payments to others	3	5	5
12.33	Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges	5	5	5
12.40	Printing and reproduction	0	0	1
12.51	Advisory and assistance services	11	10	11
12.52	Other services	239	668	272
12.53	Purchases of goods and services from Government accounts	498	470	500
12.54	Operation and maintenance of facilities	4	4	4
12.55	Research and development contracts	4	4	4
12.57	Operation and maintenance of equipment	8	8	8
12.60	Supplies and materials	4	4	4
13.10	Equipment	21	20	20
14.10	Grants, subsidies, and contributions	206	195	206
14.20	Insurance claims and indemnities	9	8	11
19.90	Subtotal, Direct obligations	1294	1758	1349
	Allocation Account			
31.11	Full-time permanent	21	23	23
31.21	Civilian personnel benefits	6	7	6
32.10	Travel and transportation of persons	2	3	2
32.31	Rental payments to GSA	1	1	1
32.52	Other services	27	30	29
32.60	Supplies and materials	1	1	1
33.10	Equipment	1	1	1
34.10	Grants, subsidies, and contributions	80	87	86
39.90	Subtotal, Allocation Account	139	153	149
	Below reporting threshold	1	0	2
	Reimbursable obligations	90	300	300
	TOTAL OBLIGATIONS	1524	2211	1800

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Object Classification
(Dollars in Millions)

	Account and Object Class	Actuals 1998	Estimate 1999	Request 2000
LUST Trust Fund				
	Direct obligations			
	Personnel Compensation	5	6	5
12.31	Rental payments to GSA	1	1	1
12.52	Other services	1	1	1
12.55	Research and development contracts	1	1	1
14.10	Grants, subsidies, and contributions	56	66	64
19.90	Subtotal, Direct obligations	64	75	72
99.95	Below reporting threshold	1	0	0
	TOTAL OBLIGATIONS	65	75	72
State and Tribal Assistance Grants				
	Direct obligations			
12.52	Other services	5	5	5
12.53	Purchases of goods and services from Government accounts	21	20	20
14.10	Grants, subsidies, and contributions	3397	4542	2813
	TOTAL OBLIGATIONS	3423	4567	2838
Office of Inspector General				
	Direct obligations			
	Personnel compensation	24	27	24
12.10	Travel and transportation of persons	2	2	1
12.31	Rental payments to GSA	3	1	2
12.53	Purchases of goods and services from Government accounts	2	2	2
13.10	Equipment	1	1	0
19.90	Subtotal, Direct obligations	32	33	29
	Reimbursable obligations	12	12	11
	TOTAL OBLIGATIONS	44	45	40

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Object Classification
(Dollars in Millions)

	Account and Object Class	Actuals 1998	Estimate 1999	Request 2000
Buildings and Facilities				
	Direct obligations			
12.54	Operation and maintenance of facilities	12	8	26
13.20	Land and structures	105	69	37
	TOTAL OBLIGATIONS	117	77	63